

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 2-6 and 11-13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The office action incorrectly indicates that there is a 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph rejection associated with these claims since the office action indicates that the previous amendment overcame the outstanding indefiniteness rejection.

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 16-23 are allowed.


Remaining claims 1, 7-9, 10, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mizuno et al. As to claims 1 and 10, among other things, it is argued that the claim language “does not expressly state that ‘each of the computing devices’ has a respective ‘threshold voltage’ or that the voltages are different, this language can be interpreted as having the same ‘threshold voltage’”.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to include inherent language that each of the plurality of computing devices has one of a plurality of different threshold voltages. This inherent language is also consistent with the suggested language proposed by the Examiner in the final action. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/23/05

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005